

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated November 3, 2006. Claims 19 and 21 to 24 remain in the application, with Claim 20 having been cancelled herein. Claims 19, 23 and 24 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner and his supervisor for the courtesies and thoughtful treatment accorded Applicants' undersigned representative during the July 25, 2007 personal interview. This Amendment has been prepared in accordance with the discussions and agreements reached during that interview.

In the Office Action, Claims 19 to 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,959,318 (Tso) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,556,217 (Makipaa) and further in view of Spyglass. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested in light of the following comments.

The invention relates to orders and adapts documents (e.g., web pages) for output before a request for a document is received. In the invention, a server receives, from a user terminal, a first access request for access to a first document. The access request includes characteristics of the user terminal, which are acquired by the server from the first access request. Utilizing the acquired characteristics, the server determines an order for adapting documents for outputting the documents based on a frequency of access to the documents. The server then selects documents to be adapted in the determined order before a second request for access to a second document is received, and adapts the documents for output, wherein the documents that are adapted are those in which the frequency of access is higher than a threshold. As a result, further documents to be accessed are properly adapted for output to the user terminal prior to the user terminal

issuing a second access request so that a more efficient document providing operation can be obtained.

Referring specifically to the claims, amended independent Claim 19 is a server for providing a document via a network, comprising receiving means for receiving a first request for access to a first document from a user terminal, acquiring means for acquiring characteristics related to the user terminal contained in the first access request, determining means for determining an order for adapting documents for outputting the documents according to a frequency of access to the documents, selecting means for selecting documents to be adapted according to the determined order, adapting means for adapting for output, in accordance with the acquired characteristics related to the user terminal, the selected documents in the determined order before receiving a second request for access to a second document, wherein the adapting means adapts for output documents in which the frequency of access is higher than a threshold, receiving means for receiving a second request for access to a second document, reading means for reading out the second document, which has been adapted by the adapting means, upon reception of the second request for access to the second document, and sending means for sending the second document read out by the reading means to the user terminal.

Claims 23 and 24 are method and computer program claims, respectively, that substantially correspond to Claim 19.

The applied art, alone or in any permissible combination, is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of Claims 19, 23 and 24, and in particular, is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the features of a server adapting for output, in accordance with characteristics related to a user terminal that are acquired from a first access request, documents that are selected to be adapted according to an order that is determined

according to a frequency of access to the documents, before receiving a second request for access to a second document, wherein the server adapts for output documents in which the frequency of access is higher than a threshold.

Tso merely teaches pre-fetching documents by retrieving documents corresponding to hyperlinks contained in a web page so that the web pages corresponding to those hyperlinks are waiting in cache in the event the user selects one of the hyperlinks. What is lacking in Tso, however, is the feature of determining an order for adapting the documents based on a frequency of access to the documents, and then adapting the documents in the determined order before receiving a request for a second document.

Makapaa merely teaches adapting documents according to characteristics of a user terminal. In Makapaa, the documents are only retrieved and adapted when the user requests access to the documents. Thus, at best, the combination of Tso and Makapaa would pre-fetch documents corresponding to hyperlinks contained in a retrieved web page and caching the pre-fetched documents (Tso's teaching), but the documents would then only be adapted after the user requests access to a pre-fetched document by selecting the hyperlink (Makapaa's teaching). In other words, although the document is pre-fetched, it is not adapted before the user requests the document. Thus, the proposed combination fails to teach the claimed invention.

Spyglass is not seen to aid in overcoming the deficiencies of Tso and Makapaa. In this regard, Spyglass is seen to teach that copies of documents that have been fetched and adapted are maintained in cache. That is, when documents are retrieved, a copy of the retrieved document is kept in cache. If the document was previously adapted and output, a copy of the previously adapted and output document may be kept in cache. According to Spyglass, the documents are ordered based on their order of having been

retrieved. Ordering documents based on their order of retrieval however, is not the same as ordering documents based on a frequency of access. Additionally, Spyglass fails to teach adapting documents in which the frequency of access is higher than a threshold.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Claims 19, 23 and 24, as well as the claims dependent therefrom, are believed to be allowable.

No other matters having been raised, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office by telephone at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Edward Kmett/

Edward A. Kmett
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCIS_WS 1537137v1